

MINUTES
TRANSPORTATION ASSET MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
December 6, 2006
Aeronautics Building
Lansing, Michigan

Meeting noticed in accordance with Open Meetings Act, Public Act 267 of 1976.

Present

Carmine Palombo, Chairman
Robert Slattery, Vice-Chairman
David Bee, Member
Jerry Richards, Member
Kirk Steudle, Member
Susan Mortel, Member

Howard Heidemann, Member
Steve Warren, Member
Eric Swanson, Member
Bill McEntee, Member
Frank Kelley, Commission Advisor

Staff Present

Rick Lilly- Bureau of Transportation Planning
Stacey Schafer- Bureau of Transportation Planning
Ron Vibbert- Bureau of Transportation Planning
Terry McNinch- Michigan Tech

Absent

Spencer Nebel, Member

Call to order

The meeting was called to order at 1:00 P.M.

Approval of November 1, 2006 Minutes

Mr. Richards moved for the approval of the November minutes, supported by Mr. Bee. Motion carried.

Correspondence and Announcements - Rick Lilly

Mr. Lilly reported that the Council members should have received a copy of the 2007 meeting schedule.

Agency Reports

No reports

Closing data gaps: Review & Discussion of Analysis from MTU staff

Mr. McNinch was asked to come up with a plan on how to close the data gap that we have in the model. Mr. McNinch and his staff put some things together and have made some recommendations. Mr. Lilly, Mr. Vibbert, Mr. McNinch, and Tim Colling met and they would like to propose a process that will work on getting a couple of runs out, attempting to close the gaps.

One of the big problems is that we are trying to take the cost data out of the investment tool. The first step is to let the investment tool be the investment tool. Its purpose is to report on the investments to the legislature, required by law. We are trying to get the investment tool to do too much right now, when all we want is correct data and compliance. First recommendation is that we not use the cost data for the model. MAT wants to get together with Jon Galbreath, from MDOT staff, who does MDOT cost and figures for the RQFS model. MAT wants to look at what Mr. Galbreath's costs are and use those to run in the model on the trunkline system. MAT is proposing to bring Mr. Galbreath into the MAT team, and look at what costs we are going to include in the model. Once we settle on those, MAT will get Mr. Galbreath to look at what the costs were for 2003-2005 for the trunkline system and then go back and actually do a run. Looking at a strategy and what it would cost to maintain that system for the next 10 years. MAT would also like to setup a committee of local engineers to try to come up with ways to close the gap on the local data and using some costs from their bid costs. MAT recommends that this be done, including MDOT, county, and city engineers. The team thinks that this will work and go a long way in answer some of the questions. Eventually the Council is going to have to make a decision as to what is going to be run in the model in terms of cost.

Mr. McNinch noted that it does not push off the question of the pot of money; it defers it to later on and simplifies it. MAT feels pretty good about this procedure.

Mr. Warren thinks that we are on the right track. Mr. Warren thinks that it is still going to require us to get information from agencies voluntarily in terms of what they did, their limits, what is was, and what it will be in the future.

Mr. McEntee thinks that this is a step in the right direction. The point on the investment tool is correct; there is nothing there that gives us what the fixed cost is on the surface, rather how we invest money in the transportation system.

Mr. McNinch indicated that what Mr. Galbreath does with RQFS is a really good approach because he has narrowed it down to the functional roadway. It covers drainage but does not go beyond it.

Mr. Lilly indicated that MAT would expect to do a run once they get the unit cost that MDOT is using in RQFS. It is expected that sometime in January a run will be able to get done. If this works, then we get the engineer committee going and talk about the other unit costs that we can continue over the first quarter of the year and continue the runs.

Mr. Warren is concerned that we are trying to get more information than we are required too, even on the investment reporting. Mr. Warren thinks that they are on the right track in terms of quantifying the average cost for various fixes. Mr. Warren indicated that the engineer committee might be a good way to go in terms of learning from other reporting requirements.

Mr. Warren envisioned that someday there would be the ability to simply ask people what they did, how they did it, and when they did it. In terms of our reporting requirement to the legislature, Mr. Warren added that with this information about the level and type of work and with other data we already have with Act 51, we could make some qualified reports. Mr. Warren indicated that information like this would be understandable and useful to the legislature, making it projectable in the future.

Mr. Lilly indicated that there is another option. As we try to close these gaps, we could attempt to run the PASER data through the same process as that the bridge condition forecasting system uses and see whether or not we get results that look logical or not. The group is saying that they think they can close these gaps quicker and get some results out of the model for the Council to look at. This would determine whether or not that approach makes sense as opposed to going in a different direction or technique.

Mr. Steudle indicated that it is important for us to remember what we are charged with because it's so easy to get wrapped up in other things. The Council's charge is to look at, and answer the question posed by Mr. Warren, the amount of money we spent and what we have to show for it. As a Council we have to make sure that we are not creating a pavement management system for 120,000 miles of road, that was not our charge and we should not be looking at that. We should be looking at something that is going to answer the question about the data we need in order to get some answers. Mr. Steudle stated that we need to make sure that we are answering the Council's strategic network questions.

Mr. Lilly indicated that the group is hoping to have a run by the next Data Management Committee meeting. Deterioration curves will be addressed in 2007. Triggers and fixed lives will be worked on by the engineer committee. If there are recommendations as to how we can solve these things, they need to be brought to the Council's attention.

Discussion regarding 2007 Investment Reporting

Mr. Lilly indicated that we have some numbers that have been sent out. Overall, 269 agencies were compliant, that is that they actually registered and reported a project. It covers 70% of all the total miles. 71% of the agencies have registered which covers 96% of the miles. Even though 28% of the agencies did not report,

it was only 4% of the total miles. We have a good start for the first year; this information has been put into the Supplemental Report. There were a total of 4,731 miles of work that was reported, of which 3000 was in capital preventative maintenance (CPM), about 1500 in structural improvement (SI), and just under 200 in routine maintenance (RM). \$1.13 billion dollars is listed, with almost a billion in structural improvement (SI). While there were 3000 miles in CPM, only \$130 million was spent in CPM. We are substantially under, but this is not a bad start for the first report.

Mr. Surber passed out a draft letter to all the registered users of the internet tool. In the registration CGI collects the internet addresses of the key contacts in order to communicate back with those individuals. The idea is that as soon as decisions are made today we are in position to send out this letter announcing the new tool and the various suggestions on how to go about using the improvements. The improvements are listed in the letter.

A letter was also drafted to encourage greater participation. The letter asks that those that are not registered get registered. The letter gives assistance on how to get this done. Training was not mentioned in this letter, but they are going to be notified of the different trainings. It is suggested that a face to face training be held and then follow up with a couple online courses. CGI does have access to online training similar to Michigan Tech. Mr. Slattery indicated that he likes the online training idea and this would be a good application on this type of training rather than having people travel. Regarding the letter to the MPO, let them know that we need them to be the liaisons between the agencies. We need to make sure that these letters get to the correct person. If we are unsure of whom this is we need to get assistance from the MPO's. They should be able to assist in identifying the right person.

Mr. Surber suggested that these letters be both mailed and emailed to the correct people. Mr. Palombo suggested that we mail them, but if we are going to email them, ask recipients if they would be interested in hosting a training session.

Update on PASER Data Collection – Rob Surber

Mr. Surber passed out a map of the data that was received. Mr. Surber indicated that Shiawassee and Lapeer have submitted it, but it was in the wrong format. Saginaw is also completed. Cass County is supposed to be submitted today. By the end of today everything should be in house and processed.

Mr. Lilly reported on the number of agencies that have registered to do the local PASER data and who has submitted data as of today. There are four counties that have submitted all county road commissions. No cities have submitted anything. Mr. Lilly indicated that he did not get as many as he was hoping for; in general the data that is coming in appears to be good. Mr. Surber indicated that they have not found any data that has not checked out so far.

Approval of 2007 Training Schedule and Program

Mr. Lilly introduced the training schedule to the Council. Mr. McNinch put together this training schedule, if approved these dates will begin to be scheduled.

Mr. Slattery moved for the approval of the training schedule, supported by Mr. Bee. Motion carried.

The training schedule will be posted on the Council's webpage.

Approval of Supplemental Report

Mr. Lilly presented the Supplemental Report to the Council for their approval.

Mr. Warren pointed out a few changes that need to be made. These changes were noted and Mr. Lilly is going to make the necessary corrections.

Mr. Richards moved to approve the Supplemental Report, supported by Mr. McEntee. Motion Carried.

Public Comment

Rich Mangus commented on the internet reporting tool and training discussed earlier in meeting. The Council members addressed his issues.

Adjournment

Meeting was adjourned at 3:30pm